



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Oryginale Chronicle of Andrew of Wyntoun (1350?-1420?). Boswell remarks that the story of the Pope is utilized by Lodge in *The Divil Conjured* (1596). According to Boswell, too, William Vincent (1739-1815), Dean of Westminster, communicated to Malone under date of February 19, 1806 a passage from Anna Comnena's (b. 1083) *Alexias* (6. 6), where, recounting the death of Robert Guiscard, she relates how, reaching the island of Cephalonia, he resigned himself to death on learning that there was in this island a city called Jerusalem. Vincent, who was a good authority (see *Dict. Nat. Biog.*), says in his letter: 'How a Jerusalem came to have been built in Cephallenia I shall not attempt to explain; but the Holy Sepulchre was visited, from devotion or pilgrimage, several centuries before 1085, and temples might consequently have been built in Cephallenia, as well as in other Christian countries. A city of Jerusalem seems highly dubious.'

The foregoing is from the Variorum Shakespeare of 1821, vol. 17, pp. 196-8, which however, does not translate the Greek. I render as follows, using the text of Schopen's edition of 1839: 'Remaining at Athera, a promontory of Cephalonia, he was seized with a violent fever. Unable to endure the burning of the fever, he craved cold water. When his attendants were scattered in all directions to search for it, one of the natives exclaimed: "See this island of Ithaca. In it was built of old a city called Jerusalem, though now it is overthrown by time. Here was a spring of water, always good to drink and cold." Robert, hearing this, was seized with mortal terror, for, putting together Athera and the city of Jerusalem, he realized that his death was at hand. For it had been prophesied by certain ones—as flatterers are wont to speak to princes—that he should subdue everything as far as Athera, and that thence proceeding to Jerusalem, he should meet his end. Whether the fever wasted him away, or whether a pleurisy, I have not been able to ascertain, but certain it is that on the sixth day he died.'

The story in course of time reached Giovanni Villani (ca. 1275-1348), and is thus related, as I now find, in his *Croniche Fiorentine*, 4. 19 (tr. Gelfe, pp. 88, 89): 'Thus Robert Guiscard, after having done many and noble things in Apulia, purposed and desired, by way of devotion, to go

to Jerusalem on pilgrimage; and it was told him in a vision that he would die in Jerusalem. Therefore, having commended his kingdom to Roger, his son, he embarked by sea for the voyage to Jerusalem, and arriving in Greece, at the port which was afterwards called after him, Port Guiscard, he began to sicken of his malady; and trusting in the revelation which had been made to him, he in no wise feared to die. There was over against the said port an island, to the which, that he might repose and recover his strength, he caused himself to be carried, and after being carried there he grew no better, but rather grievously worse. Then he asked what this island was called, and the mariners answered that of old it was called Jerusalem. Which they having heard, straightway, certified of his death, devoutly he fulfilled all those things which appertain to the salvation of the soul, and died in the grace of God.'

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

A FIFTEENTH-CENTURY SATIRICAL DIALOGUE,

SEEMINGLY AKIN TO THE SPECIES KNOWN

AS *fatras* OR *fatrasie*,

AND

DEALING WITH FOOLS CALLED *Coquars*.

In the summer of 1904, while seeking in the British Museum material bearing on the farce of *Pathelin*, the present writer happened upon a ms.¹ which can hardly fail to interest various Romance scholars, but particularly those who have acquainted themselves with the history of dramatic literature in France.

This ms., catalogued under "Additional Manu-

¹The ms. is of paper and measures approximately ten inches in height by eight in breadth. It is in excellent condition. Black ink was employed except for the *Explicit* of Pierre de Nesson's *Testament*. There are no decorations or miniatures.

Perhaps this ms. is known to more scholars than one,—it may even have been printed, but this latter possibility constitutes a risk which has often to be run, and, should the possibility be a fact, I shall be grateful if whoever is in a position to increase my information will do so.

scripts," and bearing the number 28790, contains four short poems, copied about the middle of the fifteenth century by a scribe whose handwriting is of the cursive type known as debased Gothic. In his valuable *Recueil de Fac-similés d'Écritures du V^e au XVII^e Siècle*, Paris, 1904, Mr. Maurice Prou offers a specimen closely resembling the ms. in question. See Pl. xxxvii, upper document, dated 1446. Another specimen of the same style is to be found in N. de Wailly's *Éléments de Paléographie*, II, 262, Pl. x. Yet, though the handwriting of medieval scribes is far more uniform than modern handwriting, identity of style is not implied in the present case. We may safely surmise that this ms. originated between 1430 and 1470. Furthermore the writer's language and style belong to this period rather than to the very beginning or end of the century. The ms. seems to contain no allusion definite enough to afford another means of dating the poems in it. That they all originated at the same time is most unlikely; indeed it is possible that the poem with which we are about to deal came into being before 1430, rather than later, and that it may have undergone certain alterations; or, again, it may be merely a belated specimen of the particular form of literature to which it seems to belong. In short, various conjectures are allowable. But we should record a remarkable feature.

There are, as has been said, four poems. First comes the *Testament de Maître Pierre de Nesson*, a thing of very slight literary merit. It covers nearly 15 pages, with about 20 verses to the page, divided into irregular strophes which are composed of octosyllabic lines, riming aa, bb, etc. This *Testament*, like several others of the fifteenth century, is pious in tone. It in no wise resembles Villon's two masterpieces. Under the last verse are these words: "Explicit le testament de maistre pierre de nesson."²

Next comes a pious ballade, which is followed by a dialogue entitled, "Bourgogne au bastart et Bouton." 13 uninteresting decasyllabic strophes, riming aabccb. Fourth and last comes the *sottie*, if such it is, with which we are concerned.

²A friend writes from Paris that the Bibliothèque Nationale has a ms. catalogued thus: "Pierre de Nesson—Testament en vers. ms. f. f. 3887, fols. 219^{ro}–223^{vo}, fol. 219: 220 x 302 mm. xv^e s."

Now the remarkable feature about the ms. is this: Scrawled on the first page of the ballade are these words,—

"Vostre fol

J D cleves."

Again, beneath the *Envoi*, and in the same handwriting, we read the motto—

"Tout ce que vous voudrez

Jean De Cleves."

No doubt this man was the court fool of the high noble, prince, or king to whom this ms. seems once to have belonged,³ and as the handwriting indicates, Jean de Clèves scribbled in his master's book not long before, or after, the year 1500. The jester's whim, fulfilling the old saw as to fools' names and fools' faces, lends extraordinary interest to this ms. and makes of it one of the most rare and curious documents. For there is no good reason to suppose that the signature is a humbug or a forgery; but there is, on the other hand, excellent ground for believing that this is one of the few examples, if not the only example extant of the signature of a court fool. But who was this Jean de Clèves? Had he any interest in our piece? Or did he merely avail himself of his special privilege as a fool, like many fools before and since his time, to mar the ms.? Again, did this ms. belong to the fool's employer, or to the fool? These are hard nuts to crack,—at all events they are hardly to be answered by any one whom an ocean separates from the Bibliothèque Nationale and the British Museum. There exist, it is true, several histories of court fools,⁴ but they are so similar that one would only have to skip the title-page to imagine that they were but various editions of one book, so faithfully does each author cling to the facts and methods of his predecessor.

Whatever the truth may be as to Jean de Clèves, the document before us deserves consideration; for not only does it contain many phenomena of linguistic interest, but it plainly is a type of what we may broadly designate as "dramatic

³And not a public mountebank or member of a band of *sots*; for in that case he would hardly have signed himself "Vostre fol." Another Jean de Clèves, to wit, Jean I, duc de Clèves (1419–1481), is several times mentioned by Philippe de Commines.

⁴The best is that by A. Gazeau, entitled *Les Bouffons* (1882).

literature."⁵ The absence of any title is to be regretted; for had we a title, we might at least know to what kind of literature the piece was supposed to belong by the scribe or by its author. Having no such indication we are bound to rely wholly upon the authority of modern scholars, and especially upon that of Mr. Emile Picot, in whose scientific study of "*La sottie en France*" (*Romania*, 1878) we find the following statements: "*La sottie n'est d'abord qu'un dialogue, presque entièrement dénué d'action; c'est la parade proprement dite, dont les Menus Propos sont le type; mais peu à peu on y introduit une action, qui tient tantôt de la moralité, tantôt de la farce.*" (See page 248.) "*La seconde espèce de sottie, appelée aussi jeu de pois pilés, était un poème dramatique; c'était, dans le principe du moins, une simple fatrasie divisée en couplets et récitée en public par des sots ou des badins; les mêmes règles étaient applicables aux deux compositions.*" (See page 237.)

How closely our poem fulfills these conditions, will be seen. Of the *fatrasie*, or *fatras*, Mr. Picot has this to say: "*c'est une série de traits et de mots disparates qui n'ont d'autre liaison que la rime. L'extrême diversité des vers qui se suivent, le brusque passage d'une idée à une autre, l'amoncellement des proverbes et des allusions satiriques sont les principaux mérites du genre. La fatrasie donna naissance à deux espèces de sottie: l'une destinée à être récitée dans des concours de rhétorique; l'autre, au contraire, ayant un caractère dramatique.*" (See pages 236-237.)

These three statements constitute an admirably clear introduction to the text with which we are concerned, and of which we shall cite all but a few strophes or verses which are so barren of interest, in the opinion of the present writer, that they are hardly worth knowing.

Mr. Picot draws no hard and fast line between the *fatrasie* and the early *sottie*. Nor would a sharp distinction be possible; for had the "play" not grown gradually out of the *fatrasie*, the laws

according to which a given literary form develops out of one or several earlier forms would be broken. Although the documents that illustrate the history of the development of literature are not characterised by the smoothness and barely perceptible transitions observable in the evolution of purely physical things, it would be rash to declare that literary development is ever marked by leaps from one form to another of an essentially different character.

In considering literary development, two important facts are to be borne in mind: First, that men express only a small part of their current knowledge or individual ideas at any given moment; secondly, that they always borrow from one another or from the works of earlier men, and finally that an immense number of medieval documents have been lost. This is specially true of dramatic, and more still of truly popular dramatic literature throughout the Middle Ages. Theatrical folk enjoyed no copyright then, and endeavoured therefore to keep their stock and store from becoming public property. Again, the few copies of farces, *sotties*, etc., in the hands of players, whether belonging to some guild or owned by random minstrels, whose life was hardly such as to preserve their literary possessions from destruction, were mostly thumbed out of existence, and when a play or dialogue, or other piece, had served its purpose, its natural and all too common fate was to disappear for good and all. We must thus account for the fact that only three (or, rather, four) mss. of *Pathelin* have survived; yet *Pathelin* enjoyed a vogue not paralleled by any other piece in the Middle Ages. Of these mss. one, at least, namely the Harvard ms., was copied from a printed text belonging to the group catalogued by Messrs. Piaget and Picot in their edition of Guillaume Alexis, vol. i, pp. 179-182.

In his comprehensive essay on the *sottie*, Mr. Picot enumerates only twenty-six specimens in all. It is not rash to believe that these, along with the few specimens added by Mr. Picot in the *Recueil général des Sotties* which he has lately edited⁶ for the *Société des Anciens Textes*, do not constitute a hundredth of those that came into being. The earliest *sottie* in his *Recueil* came into being prob-

⁵ Of course our piece is itself essentially undramatic, at all events according to modern conceptions; but so, for instance, are not a few of the early farces, notwithstanding their original titles; for they are often mere dialogues without the shred of a plot, or even a leading thought, and nothing "happens."

⁶ Only the first volume is at hand.

ably between 1410 and 1435. The verses presently to be quoted belong, as we have seen, to approximately that time. Before quoting them, however, it is necessary to make various observations.

Our poem, though sprightly in style and interesting in matter, is not really poetry. The author was fairly clever, but his verses are prose, after all. Nor can he be said to have original ideas. His vague notions as to right and wrong, as to wisdom and folly, are a part of the feelings that almost every thinking man had before the Reformation. There is scarce a strophe in his poem that does not remind one of something quite like it in Brant's *Narrenschiff*. There is no ship, to be sure, but the idea that folly holds sway is there. And, needless to say, this belief, sanctioned in part by passages in the Bible, and invigorated further by the Feast of Fools, to which custom, it gave in turn ample suggestion of drollery, was common a good while before Brant compiled his *Narrenschiff*. In this particular poem the word *coquard* is employed for *sot*, but this feature is due no doubt to a fancy of the author rather than to any intention to distinguish *sottie* from *coquardie* or *sot* from *coquard*. *Coquard* is merely another word, once figurative, but soon rubbed bare of its colour, used to describe a *sot* or fool. When Guillaume Jouceaume begins to dun Guillemette for the money that Pathelin owes him, Guillemette mockingly replies :

"Ha, Guillaume,
Il ne fault point couvrir de chaume
Ici, ne bailler ces brocars.
Alés sormer à vos cocars,
A qui vous vouldriez jouer."

(vv. 531-534).

And further on (vv. 858-859) the bewildered draper demands of Guillemette, —

Mais comment parle il proprement
Picard? Dont vient tel cocardie?

Examples of *cocardie* are rare enough in the fifteenth century, but *coquard* occurs times without number. Whatever special meaning this word may have had at the outset, it came in time to signify "fool" and little else, though "fool" is a pretty comprehensive word, as the good Sebastian Brant opined. In 1611 Cotgrave defines the expression thus : "*Coquard* : m. A

proud gull, peart goose, quaint fop, saucie dolt, malapert coxcombe, rash or forward cokes." And he adds this saying, "Mieux vaut l'ombre d'un sage vieillard que les armes d'un jeune coquard : Prov. *The shadow of an advised grandsire is better than the sword of an adventurous goosecap.*" What this delightful old lexicographer has to say of *coquarde* is equally amusing : "*COQUARDE. bonnet à la coquarde. A Spanish cap, or fashion of bonnet used by the most substantial men of yore ; Tearmed so (perhaps) because those that wore of them grew thereby the prouder, & presumed the more of themselves, also, any bonnet, or cap, worn proudly, or peartly on th' one side.*" Cotgrave does not quote *cocardie*, which had probably become obsolete, but he has *cocardise* : "*Cocardise* : f. *Fond pride, sauciness, presumption, malapertness, unadvised peartnesse, iollitie, chearfulness, cocketnesse.*" About 1530 Palsgrave offered *cocard* as a French equivalent of "malapert." See *L'Esclaircissement*, etc., p. 918. The context of our piece makes it pretty clear, furthermore, that a *cocard* (or *coquard*) was not really a dunce, but a silly snob, an upstart, a blunderer, a blackguard, a conceited ass, a prattler, a rascally good-for-nothing, a spendthrift, etc., etc.; in short, he was a fool. In the fifteenth century this word had become a fad : by the middle of the seventeenth century it was perhaps forgotten.

In form alone is our poem dramatic. It has not even an embryonic plot, nor is there anything about it suggestive of "stage business." Doubtless it was spoken by two performers, who may have executed a few gestures ; but that they frolicked or went through acrobatic feats (a common feature of the true *sottie*) is most improbable. What we have is a mere dialogue, devoid of action. There is no consistent differentiation of the two speakers, whose character, furthermore, does not enter into the piece. They satirize, but their satire does not really strike home. No definite individual is attacked, nor is any recognizable government under fire, save that of the Pope. But here the taunts are so vague that they would apply to the papal court long before the Reformation. In short, the satire is much like that which Brant later brought to bear in his *Narrenschiff*.

Not only is our dialogue characterized by satire,

but it also contains numerous proverbs or proverbial locutions (See verses 12, 13, 27, 74, 100, 146, 150, 180, 201, 204, 228, 230, 231, 232, 233-234,¹ 258, 260). The heaping up of proverbs marks, as Mr. Picot has said, the primitive form of the *sottie* known as a *fatrasie*.

In one significant characteristic our dialogue differs especially from the twenty-six specimens described and quoted from by Mr. Picot. With the exception of the first two strophes, which are octosyllabic, all the verses contain ten syllables. There are several examples of decasyllabic verse in the *sotties* catalogued by Mr. Picot, but they are of no great length. Perhaps the writer of the piece before us found that he was hampered by the shorter line; or it may be that our dialogue was originally octosyllabic and that whoever re-vamped it preferred the decasyllabic line, to which measure he changed all but the two stanzas mentioned.

As to the rime, we may call attention to *tromper* and *enfer* (vv. 195 and 198). The rime order is a a b c c b throughout.

The text, which now follows the introduction, differs from that of the ms. only in that certain tediously irrelevant strophes or verses have been omitted, that capitals have been more liberally used, and that the whole piece has been punctuated so as to bring out what each sentence seemed to mean. Abbreviations in the ms. are indicated by italics. All numbers and diacritical marks are mine.

THE TEXT.

L'acteur (*i. e.*, l'auteur).¹

- 1 Après les princes et les dames,²
Et les gouges de maintes games,³

¹ "Baillez lui la massue
A celui qui cuide estre
Plus subtil que son maistre,
Et sans raison l'argue."

—Charles d'Orléans, II, 99.

¹ "A vous seul, comme a nostre acteur, devons louange," etc.—Words of the seraphim in A. Greban's *Mistère de la passion*, 334-5.

² "After hearing about," etc.; or, "Now that the princes, etc., have had their turn."

³ Cf. Charles d'Orléans, Héricault's ed., Paris, 1896, Vol. II, p. 32, Chan. LI:

Trop entré en la haulte game,
Mon cuer, d'ut, ré, mi, fa, sol, la,

Demande⁴ tour de prothocolle,⁵

Qui de cocquarts fait mension,

Escript à la correction

- 6 De ceulx qui sont de telle escole.

Response.

- 7 Tant qu'est à moy, Je suis content

Que me desclairiez plainnement

Des coquars la forme⁶ é maniere,

Sans faire à quelqung blasme ou tort,

Et aussi par vostre rapport

- 12 Lequel⁷ doit porter la baniere.

L'acteur.

- 13 Cocquart mignot⁸ qui desconnoit⁹ la gâche,¹⁰

Ja soit venu¹¹ de basse et humble place,

Qui aux plus grans se veult comparer,

Meismes leur est en son tort leur desplaire,¹²

Doit pou durer et fin obscure faire,—

- 18 Voire et eust il Roy vueillant le porter !

Response.

- 19 Se ung compains est de petit lieu venu,

Et de pource¹³ tant plus est il tenu

Fut jà pieça, quant l'afola

Le trait du regart de ma Dame.

Cf., also, this from the *Blason de faulces amours* by Guillaume Alexis (ed. by Piaget and Picot, vol. I, p. 209) :

Mais, quant de femme

Congnoit la game,

Lors devient melancolieux.

⁴ First pers. sing.

⁵ *Protocolle* scarcely seems to have here precisely any of the meanings recorded by Du Cange; nor does it seem to signify "prompter," as it so often did during the fifteenth, sixteenth, and even at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Verse 5 indicates pretty clearly that *protocolle* is at least an imaginary list of a satirical character. In a poem entitled "*Chambrière à louer*," Crestofle de Bordeaux (fl. c. 1550) distinctly uses *protocolle* to mean "prompter."

"Point ne me faut de protocolle,

[says the chambrière à louer]

Car je scay mon roolle par coeur."

Anciennes Poésies Françaises, I, 99.

⁶ In the scholastic sense of *forma*, the essential nature of anything.

⁷ *Quel coquard*.

⁸ "Fop," "swell."

⁹ "Does not know," "has never tasted."

¹⁰ Seems to be a figurative expression meaning "hard work." See Littré, s. v. *Gâche*, No. 1.

¹¹ "Even though," etc.

¹² This awkward verse seems to mean that the *coquard* displeases the great by his bungling.

¹³ "Then, being poor," etc. From *Yvain* (Foerster's ed., Halle, 1902, v. 61 ff.) another somewhat similar *et* may be cited :

De poursievir¹⁴ pour avoir quelquechose,
Faire¹⁵ son fait en publique ou à part ;
S'il s'oublie, je le tiens pour cocquart,

24 Et pour meschant¹⁶ (ainsi me dit ma glose).

L'acteur.

25 Cocquart,¹⁷ vanteur de femmes où n'a¹⁸ rien(z),
D'autres aussy dont a eu quelque bien,
Et est herault meismes de sa vaillance.
Quiert jeu de dés, et fait mestier d'estre yvre ;
Vit souffreteux, quelque argent qu'on ly lyvre,
30 Et souvent meurt par ung coup de meschance.¹⁹

Response.

31 Aucunesfois, pour faire seigneur rire,
N'a point de mal d'aucune chose dire,
Prenonz que soit mensonge ou vérité.
Baveurs,²⁰ menteurs, joueurs de dés, yvrongnes,
Font à la foiz sy trèsbien leur besongnes
36 Qu'ilz s'en treuvent en grand auctorité.

Responce (*sic*).

37 Cocquart,²¹ pompeux, qui tout vent et engage,
Pour maintenir ung triumpant barnaige.
Et ne ly chault d'apovrir filz ne filles.
Pert l'amitié des bons et vertueux,
Et n'est hantez que de gens vicieux,
42 Et est digne qu'on le rue à faucille.

(5 strophes omitted.)

L'acteur.

73 Cocquart,²² le clerc qui tant cuide saige estre
Que sanz son sens ne puist vivre son mestre,
Ne riens sans ly ne se peult bien conclure ;
Fait passer temps aux compaignonz de sorte
Qui [*i. e. que*], se sa mule ou sa hague²³ fût morte,

Que que il son conte contoit,
Et la reine l'escoutoit,
Si s'est de lez le roi levee
Et vint sor aus si a amblee, etc.

Compare also the *et* in a sentence such as, "Plus je le vois,
et plus je le hais."

¹⁴ Dialectal, no doubt, but to what region does the form belong?

¹⁵ "Tenu de faire." ¹⁶ Here in the modern sense.

¹⁷ Here, as further on, the definition assumes a dictionary style.

¹⁸ May be either personal or impersonal, but see v. 26.

¹⁹ This whole strophe fits François Villon.

²⁰ "Hé dieu, que vous avez de bave !" cries Guillemette to the draper, meaning "Goodness! what a prattler you are!" See *Pathelin*, 554. Palsgrave defines *baver*, as meaning "to mocke." See *L'Esclaircissement*, p. 938.

²¹ See note 17. ²² See note 17.

²³ *Hague*. Neither Littré nor Godefroy gives this word. It is simply a dialectal, and probably a Picard, form derived perhaps from a Germanic word not yet discovered. See Murray's *New Eng. Dict.*, s. v. *Hack*, also *Hackney*.

78 Le charient plus souef que l'amblure.

(3 strophes omitted.)

(The gist of them is that a *coquart* excites quarrels and is a trickster.)

L'acteur.

97 Cocquart,²⁴ qui scet parler latin congru,
Jouer d'orguez²⁵ et chanter sur le leü,
Et à musicque on ne scet gaire tel ;
Mais inconstant est comme un cocq au vent.

101-2 (Of little interest and irrelevant).

Verses 103-126 are to the effect that a clerk who knows how to play "orguez," lute and harp, will always be more welcome than a master of theology, even though the clerk be in rags or naked. A *coquart* who expects to get a benefice from the Roman Court without influence, will catch a fever for his pains and die, or come home all torn like a cur.

Verses 127-144 are too dull and pointless to be worth citing.

(Here the ms. gives no indication as to who is speaking)

145 Cocquart est bien cely qui va si loingz
Pour plonc bailler son or qu'il a ès poings,²⁶
Et pour vendre sa robbe et son mantel.
Mourir de fain, de soif, et de froidure,
Mettant son corps en sy grant aventure !
150 — Mieulx ly vaudroit demourer à l'ostel.²⁷

Verses 151-168 are not only thoroughly dull, but they shed no light on the interesting question as to the various kinds of persons known as *coquars*.

(No heading.)

169-174. A *coquart* who sells law and justice will go to hell, leaving behind him the money that he has unrighteously amassed.

²⁴ See note 17.

²⁵ The *zed* is merely graphic. Very common after mute *e* in fifteenth century documents. Cf. *e. g.*, *benefices*, v. 181.

²⁶ This verse contains a curious bit of syntax. Doubtless it should be thus construed: Cocquart . . . va si loings (pour) bailler pour plonc son or (*i. e.* l'or) qu'il a ès poings. The single *pour* contains two meanings and serves two purposes syntactically; for *pour* goes with *bailler*, denoting the end or aim, but also with *son or*, denoting an exchange. For interesting remarks on "Präpositionen gleichzeitig in zweierlei Funktion," see Tobler, *Vermischte Beiträge*, I, 181 ff., Leipzig, 1886. That we need *pour* to introduce *bailler* is indicated by its presence before *vendre*, v. 147.

²⁷ "At home."

"I am not shocked," says the *coquart*; "this is the common thing."

Response.

- 175 De vendre droit je ne m'esbahis mie : ²⁸
 Les artilleurs ²⁹ y gaignent bien leur vie.
 Se ung juge vent pour or ne pour monnoye ³⁰
 Le droit d'autrui, c'est chose constumiere.
 Quant on respand justice en tele maniere,
 180 C'est d'autrui cuir taille[r] large coroye. ³¹

L'acteur.

- 181 Cocquart, ³² qui est vendeur de beneficez,
 Et en ses faiz tout plain de mauvaiz vices,—

²⁸ This seems to mean, "At the selling of justice I am not aghast," rather than "I am not aghast over selling justice."

²⁹ According to Godefroy, "celui qui fabriquait des armes." The present example, however, certainly offers another meaning, but what it may have been would be hard to say till the word turns up in a more illuminating context.

³⁰ An extremely common locution, meaning simply "for money."

³¹ Littré cites *Le Petit Jehan de Saintré*, 24. Cotgrave (1611) cites this proverb and translates, "To spend liberally on another man's purse." In a collection of proverbs made about 1450 by Estienne Legris, and published by E. Langlois in the *Bibl. de l'École des Ch.*, vol. 60, p. 579, this proverb appears thus: "D'autrui cuir large corioie." In a footnote Langlois cites this Latin version:

"In propriis rebus laus est si largus haberis
 Dedecus alterius res large donando mereris."

The oldest example of this proverb known to me occurs in the fabliau *Du Prestre Qu'on Porte* (See the *Recueil général et complet des Fabliaux*, Vol. iv, p. 26):—

Et on voit avenir tous tans
 C'on fait d'autrui larges corioies.

The omission of the word *cuir* shows that this proverb must have been familiarly known for a good while before it got into this version of the fabliau *Du Prestre Qu'on Porte*; but what is the approximate date of the oldest ms. containing it? Unfortunately we are left in the dark on that point; yet it is highly probably that the oldest ms. belongs to the thirteenth, rather than to the fourteenth century.

In Charles d'Orléans we find two other locutions worth citing here:

Et quant tenez le bout de la courroye,
 Ung estrangier si le vous vient oster.
 I, 145.

Cuident ilz du monde tenir
 Tous les deux boutz de la courroye?
 I, 139.

See Héricault's ed., Paris, 1896.

³² See note 17.

Faulx notaires, procureurs, advocas,
 Tous courtisains ³³ usans de symonye. . . .
 Que fera Dieu d'une telle dragie? ³⁴

186 Il pugnira chascun selon son cas.

Verses 187–192 are devoid of interest.

L'acteur.

- 193 Cocquart ³⁵ qui va mengeant les crucefiz,
 En barbetant par ces ³⁶ monstiers toudiz.
 Il cuide bien nostre bon dieu tromper,
 Par mauvaise et faulse ypocrisie.
 Oï ira ³⁷ il quant il perdra la vie?
 198 Il s'en yra tout droit au puis d'enfer.

Response

- 199 Tel ne fait ³⁸ point tant qu'à nous à reprendre. ³⁹
 Dieu scet trop bien à quel fin il veult ⁴⁰ tendre.
 Aucunz le font pour abattre le pain. ⁴¹
 Et à la fois il donne bonne exemple
 Aux ignoranz d'aourer dieu en son temple,—
 204 Posé ⁴² qu'ils font à dieu barbe d'estrain. ⁴³

L'acteur

- 205–210 Not to the point.

Response

- 211–216 Not to the point.

L'acteur

- 217 Cocquart congnoiz qui en parlant s'escoute.

³³ This form differs slightly from any hitherto cited. Modern French has borrowed from the Italian. By *courtisains* the author seems to be alluding to men at the papal court.

³⁴ "Gang," "crew."

³⁵ See note 17.

³⁶ Here, as often in Old French, not more demonstrative than the modern definite article.

³⁷ A common hiatus, regular in the older verse.

³⁸ This locution, so frequent in Old French, is often equivalent to our English "It does not do to . . ." Our English locution, however, is generally negative, whereas the Old French may be either negative or positive.

³⁹ This verse seems to mean, "Such and such a one it does not do so well for any one else to chide as for us," but the sense is obscure.

⁴⁰ It refers to *Dieu*.

⁴¹ A violent metaphor, on the analogy of *Abattre du bois*, *abattre de la besogne*, etc.

⁴² "Granted that," "even though."

⁴³ "Semblablement ceux qui disent faire *barbe de fouerre a Dieu* en vsent abusivement au lieu de *gerbe de fouerre*: Qui est vn prouerbe tiré de la Bible, & usurpé contre ceux qui offroient seulement à Dieu des *gerbes de paille*, faignans offrir *gerbes de bled*, pensans appaiser Dieu par vne tromperie, lequel toutesfois cognoist le fonds, & interieur de nos pensées." Pasquier, *Les Recherches de la France*, ed. of 1633, Liure Huictiesme, Chapitre LXXII, p. 787.

S'on parle à lui, fait semblant qu'il n'oist ⁴⁴ goucte,
Et ne lui chault s'on le gabbe ou mocque,
Mais qu'on ⁴⁵ vuelle ses bourdes escouter.

Tel sot doit on vray cocquart nommer,
222 Et publier partout à son de cloque. ⁴⁶

Responce

223 Ilz sont aucunz qui vont aucunesfois
Par les rues, parlant, preschant des doiz,
Qui ne pensent point à tromper autrui.
Ils sont d'autres qui ne font que mentir,
Et en mentant prenent tout leur plaisir.
228 Qui menteur oist, ⁴⁷ il fait beaucoup ⁴⁸ pour luy.

L'acteur

229 Cocquart goutteux, lequel cuide estre amé,
Du josne ⁴⁹ cuir est bien souvent armé.
On ne l'ayme se n'est pour Dan Denier,
Et l'affule ⁵⁰ on de la houe ⁵¹ Gillet.

⁴⁴ The *s* is purely graphic. Fifteenth-century scribes and printers had a craze for so-called etymological letters, and they strewed them at random. *Scavoir* is the most common example. In Le Roy's *Pathelin* (about 1486) we find at v. 619 *moisme* for *moine*? This etymologizing tendency had begun long before the fifteenth century.

⁴⁵ "Provided that."

⁴⁶ *Cloque* for *cloche* does not necessarily imply that the author came from Picardy or Berry. He needed a word to rhyme with *mocque* and borrowed his form from a familiar dialect, precisely as poets and rimesters do nowadays. As to the expression, compare Charles d'Orléans, Héricault's ed., II, 202:

Crié soit à la clochete,
Par les rues, sus et jus, etc.

⁴⁷ See note 44.

⁴⁸ *Beaucoup* is common in the fifteenth century.

⁴⁹ *Josne*, with its spurious *s* is a frequent representative of *juvenis*, but the *josne* found here means "yellow." The line seems to contain an allusion to the yellow, leathern hue of gouty skin.

⁵⁰ Cf. *Aucassin et Nicolette*, Suchier's edition, Paderborn, 1903, p. 28:—"Et estoit afulés d'une cape," etc.

⁵¹ *Houe* is perhaps a Norman form of the modern *houe* (Old French *houce* and *houesse*). In their edition of Guillaume Alexis, Messrs. Piaget and Picot comment that *roche* in the saying,

"Tel cuide avoir jeune cheval
Qui achate une vieille roche"—

Vol. I, p. 85, is a "forme normande pour *rosse*."

That Gaston Paris was right in believing the word *gilet* to be the diminutive of the name Gil(1)e (< Aegidius) seems to me to be proved beyond the shadow of a doubt, not only by the example in the text with which we are dealing, but also by another far more interesting and corroborative example to be found in the fabliau *Des Vins D'Ouan* (XLI in the *Recueil général et complet des Fabliaux*). Here it is:

A tel cocquart baillez lui le fouet, ⁵²

234 Pour chasser hors tous les chiens du monstier.

Verses 235-252 do not enlighten the reader as to the nature of *cocquarts*, and, as they are otherwise uninteresting, they may well be omitted.

[L'acteur.]

253 Tous ces cocquars cy nommez en commun,
En leur malfaiz ne veul porter quelqun,
Maiz je vous dy, et de ce vous souviengne,
Qu'on ne doit point un malfaitteur reprendre
Vilainnement, sans son cas bien entendre;
258 Car il n'est mal dont quelque bien ne viengne.

[Responce]

259 Sy vous respons, et en ce point conclu,
Que il n'est vice qu'il n'ait quelque vertu,
Tant soit meschant nes (*sic*) de petite estoffe.
Il est ainsi, et tousjours a esté,
Et se en voulez savoir la vérité,
264 Demandés le (*sic*) à ung bon philosophe.

Explicit.

RICHARD HOLBROOK.

Columbia University.

MS. LONGLEAT 258—A CHAUCERIAN
CODEX.

Among the manuscripts of interest to students of Chaucer and his followers there are a number in private possession, to which, in spite of the

Ne sai quels sont [les vins] à la Rocele.
Menesterels, qui de vièle
Soloient les gens solacier,
Ne se savent où porchacier.
Que la bone gent est troublée
Por ce que l'en lor a emblée
La très bone *houce* *Gillet*,
Qui les marchiez fere fesoit
Et les bones gens assamblar;
Cil n'avoit pooir de trambler
Qui l'avoit en son dos vestue;
Or s'est en tel leu emsatie
Que il covient trop grant avoir
Qui la veut en pou d'eure avoir;
Les povres genz s'en souferront
Qu'en cest an ne l'afubleront,
Que trop avons mauvese anée.

⁵² Ordinarily the phrase is "bailier la massue," and *massue* means the *marotte*, or "bauble," carried by jesters. See the citation above from Charles d'Orléans, and note 1 in Piaget and Picot's edition of Guillaume Alexis, vol. I, p. 138.